1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	NORTHERN DISTRI	Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted pro hac vice) andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com Teuta Fani (admitted pro hac vice) teutafani@quinnemanuel.com 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700 Chicago, IL 60606 Telephone: (312) 705-7400 Facsimile: (312) 705-7401 Josef Ansorge (admitted pro hac vice) josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266) tracygao@quinnemanuel.com Carl Spilly (admitted pro hac vice) carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com 1300 I Street NW, Suite 900 Washington D.C., 20005 Telephone: (202) 538-8000 Facsimile: (202) 538-8100 DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA DIVISION	
17 18	CHASOM BROWN, et al., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,		
19	Plaintiffs,	Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK	
20	VS.	GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL JOINT	
21	GOOGLE LLC,	SUBMISSION PURSUANT TO DKTS. 861 &877	
22	Defendant.	Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ	
23	PATRICK CALHOUN, et al., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,	· · · · 	
24	Plaintiffs,	Case No. 4:20-cv-05146-YGR-SVK	
25	vs.	GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL JOINT	
26	GOOGLE LLC,	SUBMISSION PURSUANT TO DKTS. 983 & 990	
27	Defendant.	Referral: Hon. Susan van Keulen, USMJ	
28		Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK	
- 1	1	C N- 4.20 05146 VCD CVV	

Case No. 4:20-cv-05146-YGR-SVK

GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SEAL JOINT SUBMISSION

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Defendant Google LLC ("Google") respectfully seeks to seal certain portions of the Joint Submission Pursuant to *Brown* Dkts. 861 & 877 and *Calhoun* Dkts. 983 & 990 ("Joint Submission") filed in both cases, which contains non-public, highly sensitive and confidential business information that could affect Google's competitive standing and may expose Google to increased security risks if publicly disclosed, including details related to Google's internal projects, internal data sources, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics, which Google maintains as confidential in the ordinary course of its business and is not generally known to the public or Google's competitors. This information is highly confidential and should be protected.

This Administrative Motion pertains to the following information contained in the Joint Submission:

Document	Portions to be Filed Under Seal	Party Claiming
		Confidentiality
Joint Submission Pursuant	Highlighted Portions at:	Google
to <i>Brown</i> Dkts. 861 & 877		
and Calhoun Dkts. 983 &	Pages 1:2-3, 1:16, 1:21-22, 2:1-2, 2:4, 2:12,	
990	2:14-16, 2:18, 2:20, 2:22, 2:25, 3:1, 3:3-5, 3:9,	
	3:13, 3:18, 3:24-28, 4:2-4, 4:20, 4:25-27, 5:2,	
	5:4, 5:6, 5:8-9, 5:15, 5:20, 5:24-25, 5:27-28,	
	6:5, 6:12, 6:14, 7:8, 7:10, 7:12-13, 7:16, 7:18,	
	7:20, 7:24-28, 8:3, 8:7, 8:14, 8:18, 8:25, 8:27-	
	28, 9:1, 9:3, 9:7-9, 9:16, 9:18-20, 10:2, 11:17-	
	19, 11:25, 11:27, 12:3, 12:13-14, 12:20-21,	
	13:3, 14:7, 14:9, 14:19, 14:24-26, 15:4-6, 15:9-	
	11, 15:18, 15:20, 15:22-23	
Exhibit A – Feb. 6, 2023	Highlighted Portions at:	Google
Letter from Calhoun		
Plaintiffs	PDF Pages 2-4	
Exhibit B – Feb. 27, 2023	Highlighted Portions at:	Google
Letter from Calhoun		
Plaintiffs	Pages 1-7	

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A party seeking to seal material must "establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law" (*i.e.*, is

"sealable"). Civ. L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also "be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material." *Id*.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

In the context of dispositive motions, materials may be sealed in the Ninth Circuit upon a showing that there are "compelling reasons" to seal the information. See Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). However, a party seeking to seal information in a non-dispositive motion, such as the underlying motion here, must show only "good cause." *Id.* at 1179-80. The rationale for the lower standard with respect to non-dispositive motions is that "the public has less of a need for access to court records attached only to non-dispositive motions because these documents are often unrelated, or only tangentially related, to the underlying cause of action" and that as a result "[t]he public policies that support the right of access to dispositive motions, and related materials, do not apply with equal force to non-dispositive materials." Kamakana, 447 F.3d at 1179; see also TVIIM, LLC v. McAfee, Inc., 2015 WL 5116721, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015) ("Records attached to non-dispositive motions are not subject to the strong presumption of access.") (citation omitted). Under the "good cause" standard, courts will seal statements reporting on a company's users, sales, investments, or other information that is ordinarily kept secret for competitive purposes. See Hanginout, Inc. v. Google, Inc., 2014 WL 1234499, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2014); Nitride Semiconductors Co. v. RayVio Corp., 2018 WL 10701873, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2018) (granting motion to seal "[c]onfidential and proprietary information regarding [Defendant]'s products" under "good cause" standard) (van Keulen, J.). Although the materials that Google seeks to seal here easily meet the higher "compelling reasons" standard, the Court need only consider whether these materials meet the lower "good cause" standard.

III. THE ABOVE IDENTIFIED MATERIALS SHOULD ALL BE SEALED

Courts have repeatedly found it appropriate to seal documents that contain "business information that might harm a litigant's competitive standing." *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 589-99 (1978). Good cause to seal is shown when a party seeks to seal materials that "contain[] confidential information about the operation of [the party's] products and that public disclosure could harm [the party] by disclosing confidential technical information." *Digital Reg of Texas, LLC v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 2014 WL 6986068, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2014). Materials that

could harm a litigant's competitive standing may be sealed even under the "compelling reasons" standard. See e.g., Icon-IP Pty Ltd. v. Specialized Bicycle Components, Inc., 2015 WL 984121, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 4, 2015) (information "is appropriately sealable under the 'compelling reasons' standard where that information could be used to the company's competitive disadvantage") (citation omitted). Courts in this district have also determined that motions to seal may be granted as to potential trade secrets. See, e.g. United Tactical Sys., LLC v. Real Action Paintball, Inc., 2015 WL 295584, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2015) (rejecting argument against sealing "that [the party] ha[s] not shown that the substance of the information . . . amounts to a trade secret").

Here, the Joint Submission contains confidential and proprietary information regarding highly sensitive features of Google's internal systems and operations that Google does not share publicly. Specifically, this information provides details related to Google's internal projects, internal data sources, and their proprietary functionalities, as well as internal metrics. Such information reveals Google's internal strategies, system designs, and business practices for operating and maintaining many of its important services while complying with its legal and privacy obligations.

Public disclosure of the above-listed information would harm Google's competitive standing it has earned through years of innovation and careful deliberation, by revealing sensitive aspects of Google's proprietary systems, strategies, and designs to Google's competitors. That alone is a proper basis to seal such information. *See, e.g., Free Range Content, Inc. v. Google Inc.*, No. 14-cv-02329-BLF, Dkt. No. 192, at 3-9 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2017) (granting Google's motion to seal certain sensitive business information related to Google's processes and policies to ensure the integrity and security of a different advertising system); *Huawei Techs., Co. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, No. 3:16-cv-02787-WHO, Dkt. No. 446, at 19 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2019) (sealing confidential sales data because "disclosure would harm their competitive standing by giving competitors insight they do not have"); *Trotsky v. Travelers Indem. Co.*, 2013 WL 12116153, at *8 (W.D. Wash. May 8, 2013) (granting motion to seal as to "internal research results that disclose statistical coding that is not publicly available").

1

12

13

14

8

9

10

11

16

15

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

Moreover, if publicly disclosed, malicious actors may use such information to seek to compromise Google's data logging infrastructure. Google would be placed at an increased risk of cyber security threats. See, e.g., In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig., 2013 WL 5366963, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 25, 2013) (sealing "material concern[ing] how users' interactions with the Gmail system affects how messages are transmitted" because if made public, it "could lead to a breach in the security of the Gmail system"). The security threat is an additional reason for this Court to seal the identified information.

The information Google seeks to redact, including information related to Google's internal projects and data logging systems, and internal metrics, is the minimal amount of information needed to protect its internal systems and operations from being exposed to not only its competitors but also to nefarious actors who may improperly seek access to and disrupt these systems and operations. The "good cause" rather than the "compelling reasons" standard should apply but under either standard, Google's sealing request is warranted.

IV. **CONCLUSION**

DATED: March 3, 2023

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should seal the identified portions of the Joint Submission.

QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

/s/ Andrew H. Schapiro Andrew H. Schapiro (admitted pro hac vice)

andrewschapiro@quinnemanuel.com Teuta Fani (admitted *pro hac vice*) teutafani@quinnemanuel.com 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700

Chicago, IL 60606

Telephone: (312) 705-7400

Facsimile: (312) 705-7401

Stephen A. Broome (CA Bar No. 314605) stephenbroome@quinnemanuel.com Viola Trebicka (CA Bar No. 269526) violatrebicka@quinnemanuel.com Crystal Nix-Hines (CA Bar No. 326971) crystalnixhines@quinnemanuel.com

> Case No. 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK Case No. 4:20-cv-05146-YGR-SVK

1	Alyssa G. Olson (CA Bar No. 305705)
2	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com Maria Hayrapetian (CA Bar No. 315797)
3	mariehayrapetian@quinnemanuel.com 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
4	Los Angeles, CA 90017 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
5	Facsimile: (213) 443-3100
6	Diane M. Doolittle (CA Bar No. 142046)
7	dianedoolittle@quinnemanuel.com Sara Jenkins (CA Bar No. 230097)
8	sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
9	Redwood Shores, CA 94065
10	Telephone: (650) 801-5000 Facsimile: (650) 801-5100
11	
12	Josef Ansorge (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) josefansorge@quinnemanuel.com
13	Xi ("Tracy") Gao (CA Bar No. 326266)
	tracygao@quinnemanuel.com Carl Spilly (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>)
14	carlspilly@quinnemanuel.com
15	1300 I Street NW, Suite 900 Washington D.C., 20005
16	Telephone: (202) 538-8000
17	Facsimile: (202) 538-8100
18	Jomaire A. Crawford (admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>) jomairecrawford@quinnemanuel.com
19	51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor
	New York, NY 10010 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
20	Facsimile: (212) 849-7100
21	Jonathan Tse (CA Bar No. 305468)
22	jonathantse@quinnemanuel.com 50 California Street, 22nd Floor
23	San Francisco, CA 94111
24	Telephone: (415) 875-6600
	Facsimile: (415) 875-6700
25	Attorneys for Defendant Google LLC
26	
27	
28	
	Case No. 4:20-cy-03664-VGR